



Town Meeting



Bulletin OF AMERICA'S
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
Sponsored by THE READER'S DIGEST

Russia and America—Postwar Rivals or Allies?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

NORMAN THOMAS
WILLIAM H. CHAMBERLIN

RAYMOND MOLEY
RAYMOND SWING

(See also page 12)

C O M I N G J U N E 1 4 t h

Should the German People Be Held Responsible for the Crimes of Their Nazi Leaders?

(PREVIEW IN THIS ISSUE—SEE PAGE 23)

Too often the German people have, voluntarily or by compulsion, followed leaders who have led them into wars of aggression. To what extent will punishment of present-day Germans make a recurrence of the tragedy less likely?

TUNE IN EVERY THURSDAY, BLUE NETWORK—8:30 p.m., E.W.T.

★ ★ ★ CONTENTS ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MAY 31:

"Russia and America—Postwar Rivals or Allies?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Mr. CHAMBERLIN	4
Mr. MOLEY	6
Mr. THOMAS	8
Mr. SWING	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	15



THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 7:

"Should the Lid Be Kept On Prices During Postwar Reconversion?"



THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 14:

"Should the German People Be Held Responsible for the Crimes of Their Nazi Leaders?"

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW	23
----------------------------	----

The Broadcast of May 31, 1945, originated in Town Hall in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.W.T., over the Blue Network

Town Meeting is published weekly by *The Reader's Digest*. Town Meeting Publication Office: 32 South Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1897.



Town Meeting



Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air ★ George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator

Russia and America—Postwar Rivals or Allies?

Announcer:

The Reader's Digest, America's most widely read magazine, welcomes you to a momentous radio hour. It's the big 10th Anniversary broadcast of America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of vital questions affecting your life and mine.

Tonight, at New York's historic Town Hall, four noted authorities clash over this all-important issue, "Russia and America — Postwar Rivals or Allies?" To open the discussion *The Reader's Digest* brings you the president of Town Hall, and founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Tonight's subject is No. 1 on your Town Meeting hit parade. In all the surveys we made before deciding on our 10th Anniversary program, this subject topped each list, and small wonder, because it's perfectly clear that Soviet-Amer-

ican relations are of paramount importance to the future peace and prosperity of two and a half billion human beings who are trying to live together on the same planet—a planet so small that army divisions can move half way around it by air in less time than it takes to go from New York to New Orleans by train.

Strangely enough some of our listeners protested our discussion of this important question this evening to both network and government officials lest we offend our Ally. Needless to say, neither the network nor the Government yielded to this pressure. Those who would silence public discussion of great controversial issues at this time are surely not rendering a service to the causes for which we are fighting this war.

As we begin our 11th year on the air, I'm happy and proud to report to you that at no time during the past ten years have we ever been told by any government agency or government official that

we couldn't or shouldn't discuss any particular subject. It's also a pleasure to add that both the network and our sponsors have cooperated fully in enabling us to bring to you each week discussions of the topics in which you yourselves have indicated greatest interest.

The Town Hall has and will continue to have the entire responsibility for the conduct of the program and the selection of topics and speakers.

So tonight, we discuss your No. 1 choice, "Russia and America—Postwar Rivals or Allies?" William Henry Chamberlin, who was foreign correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor* in Russia for twelve years, joins Norman Thomas, Socialist party leader and chairman of the Postwar World Council, in pointing out to us those factors which make for rivalry between these two great nations.

Raymond Moley, of the magazine *Newsweek*, and commentator for the Blue Network, joins Raymond Swing, well-known Blue Network news analyst, in pointing out those factors which should draw these two nations together as peacetime allies or partners. Now we hear first from Mr. William Henry Chamberlin. Mr. Chamberlin. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Chamberlin:

I know all of us on the platform would like to see America and Russia partners—not rivals. The prestige of the Soviet peoples has never been so high. Stalingrad

is a great symbolic name in the common victory over the Nazi enemy.

America and Russia are the two strongest land powers in the world. Political unity and cooperation between them would help to assure future peace. A Soviet regime committed to policies of nonaggression, aiming to raise the standard of living of its people within their very ample, legitimate frontiers could certainly count on American sympathy, friendship, and practical aid.

I think unity and cooperation are a two-way proposition. They presuppose sincere agreement on fundamental principles of international law and equity. They cannot be purchased by appeasement, by the surrender of basic American ideals of liberty and justice.

It would be ostrichlike blindness not to recognize that American-Soviet relations today leave much to be desired in cordiality. Putting aside minor rubs and frictions, I believe there are three basic conditions of Soviet-American understanding that have not yet been realized on the Soviet side. The first of these is mutual respect for the pledged word.

There can be no confidence among nations if treaties are considered scraps of paper and promises are made only to be broken, and here the Soviet record is disquieting. The Soviet Government in 1932, on its own initiative, concluded treaties of nonaggression with its five western neighbors—Poland, Finland, Latvia,

Lithuania, and Estonia. These treaties assured respect for existing frontiers. Every one of them has been broken by the arbitrary action of the Soviet Government.

In 1930 Stalin publicly declared, "We don't want a foot of foreign soil, but we will not surrender an inch of our own." He didn't say "We don't want a foot of foreign soil except Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Eastern Poland, Bessarabia, Northern Bucovina, Eastern Czecho-Slovakia, part of Finland, Bornholm," etc.

The Soviet Government has consistently violated the no-territorial aggrandizement and self-determination clauses of the Atlantic Charter of which it is a cosignatory. Nor is it possible to square the assurances of consultation with the secretive and brusquely unilateral pattern of Soviet conduct in Poland, Rumania, and all other countries under Russian military occupation. These assurances were given in the Moscow and Yalta agreements.

The aftermath of Yalta has been profoundly discouraging. America and England stretched conciliation to the point of appeasement in meeting Soviet territorial and political demands in the Polish question. But, Stalin has conspicuously failed to carry out his side of a very favorable bargain. He has refused to accept a single suggestion for the inclusion of democratic Poles from abroad in the new Polish Government. A group of prominent Polish leaders in Poland, men who carried the

brunt of the fight against the Nazi occupation, who Mr. Eden recently described as just the type of men who should have been consulted about the new government in Poland, have been treacherously arrested.

The brutality and chicanery that have marked Soviet policy toward Poland, the first Allied nation to take up arms against Hitler are no happy augury of Soviet goodwill and good faith in other international issues such as the treatment of Germany and the future reorganization of the Far East.

A second condition of American-Soviet understanding is the abandonment by Moscow of the aggressive technique of setting up Communist - dominated governments outside of Russia with the active aid of the Soviet army and political police.

One suspects that the death of the Communist International, like that of Mark Twain is greatly exaggerated. How else can one explain the emergence of so many veteran Comintern agents in key positions in Soviet occupied territory. Stalin's gauleiter in subjugated Poland is the Communist Bierut, in Yugoslavia the Communist Tito, in Bulgaria the Communist Dimitroff, in Rumania the Communist Patrascanu, and so on down the line.

The proposed world security organization will offer little prospect of peace or security if any country within striking range of the Red Army is likely to find a made-in-Moscow government im-

posed on it by a combination of outside force and subversive propaganda. This policy is no more like the American Good-Neighbor Policy, to which it is sometimes ineptly compared, than Stalin is like George Washington.

Third, there must be equality and reciprocity in Soviet-American relations. This most emphatically does not exist now. While Soviet journalists and observers enjoy freedom of movement in American-held territory, American correspondents are generally barred from Soviet-occupied countries. A flagrant example of unequal treatment is the discourteous conduct of Soviet military authorities toward accredited American political and military representatives in Bulgaria and other countries which the Red Army conquered with much greater ease because of eight and a half billion dollars of American lend-lease aid.

America has swallowed many insults, many broken promises, in the supposed interest of wartime unity. But American patience is wearing thin. We all hope that drastic changes in Soviet policies will make possible healthy American-Soviet cooperation on the basis of the Atlantic Charter, but it is mere wishful thinking to expect such cooperation in an atmosphere of bad faith, secretive aggressive maneuvers and persistent unilateral action on matters of common concern. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Chamberlin. Our next two speakers shared this platform ten years ago when

America's Town Meeting of the Air was inaugurated, and they are still on opposite sides of the fence. We hear now from Raymond Moley, formerly Assistant Secretary of State, now columnist for the magazine *Newsweek*, and a newcomer to the ranks of the Blue Network news commentators. Mr. Moley. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Moley:

On this 10th Anniversary, Mr. Denny, I congratulate you. You've built a great institution. I also congratulate you, Norman Thomas, for your integrity over the years, for your faith in your principles, however wrong they may be. (*Applause.*) Ten years ago you and I spoke here for Socialism and Democracy. I am still for Democracy, and so I congratulate myself. (*Applause.*)

I reduce my position tonight to a few sample propositions:

1. United States and Russia are allies. Their alliance now is the culmination of a traditional friendship of 150 years. That friendship was broken by us in 1917 when the beaten Russian Government made peace with Germany. We and our Allies then made unprovoked and undeclared war on Russia. We refused to recognize Russia for 15 years.

The recognition of Russia in 1933 was a signal achievement of the Roosevelt Administration. It was done to right a wrong and to reestablish an old friendship. (*Applause.*) I am proud of the fact that, by direction of the President, I had a hand in that reestablishment. For six months, by direc-

tion of the President, I had charge of unofficial contact with Russia. I have found that in financial dealings with Americans they had been scrupulously honest. Their political propaganda here, I shall refer to later.

In 1933, all nations who owed us defaulted on their debts except Finland. The Russian attitude was refreshing. Since that recognition, good relations with Russia has been a cardinal point in our foreign policy, and for that we owe a great debt to Franklin D. Roosevelt. (*Applause.*)

I stand pat on the tradition of 150 years. I am a conservative. Our subject tonight concerns the long future. What in the long years ahead is different from the long years in the past?

2. We are allies, and our solemn word expressed by Congress and the Executives is that we shall be allies in the new league of peace. That is our pledged word, and it's Russia's pledged word. Do my friends propose that we welsh on that?

3. Russia's pledged word has been much better than the predictions of our anti-Russians in this country. We were told in 1939 that Russia would join Germany against the West. In 1941, we were told that Russia would last three months against Germany; in 1942, that Russia would make a separate peace; in 1943, that Russia would halt her armies at the borders; in 1944, that she would stop at Warsaw; and, in 1945, that she would stop at the Oder. Are these discredited

people sound guides to the great future, I ask you? (*Applause.*)

4. Russia is interested in the temporary governments of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Austria.

Why? Except for Poland whose London government is still anti-Russian, they were allies of Hitler. We are liberating Hitler's enemies. Russia is occupying Hitler's countries. An occupying army must control the government of an enemy country. We can't permit the shooting of its soldiers in the back.

As to the future, the governments of Europe will be determined by the social, economic, and religious life of their people. The names may be Communist or Republican, but the substance is rooted in each country's civilization.

Many incidental irritations now exist between us and Russia. Most of these need a little time and patience. But, finally and most important, what is the alternative suggested by my friends tonight? Is it a build-up for another war? Are we to have ideological, political, economic, and finally, military rivalry? Are we to believe that two economic and political systems cannot coexist in the world of peace? The long future involves the keeping of faith on our side with our honored dead. What is the alternative? (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Raymond Moley. If you have heard Norman Thomas on your Town Meeting more often

than any other speaker during the past ten years, it's because you have requested him more frequently than any other and because he always makes a valuable contribution to any discussion in which he takes part. I'm happy to present to you the leader of the Socialist party, a trustee of Town Hall, and chairman of the Post-war World Council, Norman Thomas. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Thomas:

Let me preface my speech by assuring you, Mr. Moley, that I began to advocate the recognition of Russia in 1918—not 1933—and that I am so good a democrat that I do not believe that in international policies the strong have a right to order the governments of the weak who are near them. I began to say that when Woodrow Wilson attacked Mexico at Vera Cruz and I hold the same principle for America and Russia. (*Applause.*) I want the time, you can hold your applause. (*Laughter.*)

In a well-run world, the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States could never be those of rivals or allies, except in some such sense as New York and California are both rivals and allies. In the right sort of federation, the two mightiest powers might be described as friendly rivals, or allies competing for honorable leadership.

What makes the picture so different?

Principally two things: First, the lack of a substantial beginning at federation and a rigid adherence to an amoral, metaphysical doctrine of national sovereignty. The United States delegation at San Francisco, in some cases, has taken a position which is neither realistically shrewd nor idealistically hopeful in support of imperialism. The Russian delegation in some cases as, for example, in demanding that independence be the objective for all people has done a better job but their good words have been mocked by Stalin's performance in Eastern Europe.

The second fundamental difficulty is that no one in the vast territory subject to Stalin is allowed access to facts or freedom of opinion except as the dictatorship permits. Stalin does all he can to deny not only to his own people but the outside world either accurate information or the right to criticize. Witness his exclusion policy in Eastern Europe and his recent demand that the Swedish Government suppress a publication about him. On the other hand, whatever our faults in America, our Government permits much freedom of discussion even to Communists whose only principle of consistency is slavish loyalty to Stalin and his interests.

The development of a relationship like that which exists between New York and California depends on the possibility that Russians as well as Americans should enjoy in-

formation and freedom of discussion.

The present economic and political set up in the world encourages rivalry. It is a "must" for American statesmanship that it should not allow those rivalries to lead to a war that would be the most destructive and stupid in history. Success in this task will be enormously aided by finding a way to let peoples of every country know the facts and arguments on issues which already affect good understanding and may ultimately breed war. In the meantime, friendship is not promoted by practicing at Yalta, or elsewhere, the appeasement which failed so completely at Munich.

Agreeing as I do with what my colleague has said about Europe, I want to examine the situation in Asia and the Japanese war. I take as my horrible example, Max Lerner's recent editorial in *PM* in which, after mildly deprecating the arrest and disappearance of the 16 Poles, he warns us not to make too much fuss about it because we want Stalin's help for total victory over Japan, which he says might mean the difference of half a million American lives.

This is appeasement at its worst, and the peoples of the world—not just the Poles—will suffer. Edgar Snow and other journalists friendly to Stalin have already told us that Stalin's military aid will not be great and they have indicated that Stalin will treat China like an Asiatic Poland. There is some reason to believe

that he was encouraged in this at Teheran and Yalta.

Under these circumstances, especially in view of American failure to stand for the independence of colonial peoples and American willingness to underwrite at a terrible price the British, French, and Dutch empires in Asia, Stalin or his successor will be the only victor in the war of annihilation we fight against Japan for unknown objectives at tragic cost.

Stalin can accept the benefits to Russia of the complete destruction of the only strong Asiatic power and yet directly and through his Communist party, at the peace table or after, he can assume the role of friend of the people in Japan and Asia as against Anglo-American imperialism. Nothing would be more likely to lead to new war.

We shall not prevent so dire a fate by discussing generalities but only by a new policy, the first point of which must be to bring this most inhuman and brutal war to the earliest possible end appropriate to lasting peace.

The second step might well be an attempt to get Russian cooperation in calling a world conference for progressive disarmament and the general end of military conscription instead of calling, as Stalin has done, 15-year-old boys to the colors.

Japanese fanaticism cannot possibly win but aided by our own stupidity it can drag perhaps hundreds of thousands of our sons to agonizing death and lead to a

third World War. That's what we want to stop, Mr. Swing and gentlemen. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Norman Thomas. Now after that very effective statement, I'm sure that Mr. Swing will hasten to the support of his colleague, Raymond Moley. Since they are both on the Blue Network taking the same position on tonight's discussion, I'd better state that their opinions, like those of all speakers on Town Meeting, are their own and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Blue. (*Laughter.*) I am sure, however, that we are all eager to hear the views of this outstanding radio commentator and publicist, Raymond Swing. (*Applause.*)

Raymond Swing:

I'm at a loss how to answer a speech in which I have just heard a protest against what is called the appeasement of Russia at Yalta and then goes on to urge the early end of the Japanese war, for that can end soon only by the appeasement of Japan (*applause*) and I can't believe any one disliking appeasement could find the appeasement of Japan to his taste.

Now, Mr. Thomas prefers world federation and so do I. He would like a free press in the Soviet Union. So would I. But is that what we are discussing? Let's get to our theme with our feet on the ground.

I assume that we're not here to discuss newspaper editorials and articles, but national policy, and

national policy should be based not on sentiment but self-interest. The subject is not whether we like the way the Russians act and are governed or whether the Russians like the way we act and are governed.

The subject is whether, in self-interest, we should choose to be rival or ally, and by ally I understand the broader word partner. We should choose partnership with the Soviet Union because it is essential to world peace. If we and the Russians work together, the peace will be kept; no doubt about that. If we become rivals, we risk war; no doubt about that either.

The next war will be as much worse than the present one as the present one has been worse than the preceding one. We are coming into a world of concentrated power with the United States and the Soviet Union as the only two very great powers, and that is said not to disparage Great Britain or anyone else but purely as a statistical fact.

If two very great powers dedicate themselves to rivalry, that is bound to express itself in preparations for war. If the Soviet Union is a rival, the accent will be on armaments; it cannot be otherwise.

Now, no one tonight is so frank as to advocate war against the Soviet Union, but there is only one certain way to keep the peace between us in the world, and that's to create a partnership with the greatest land power on earth and

until we have done our utmost to create it, we have no right to rest or complain or criticize others.

I favor partnership with the Soviet Union because it is a natural partnership. We have nothing the Soviet Union covets and the Soviet Union has nothing that we covet. Both of us are countries with vast and ample resources. We both want peace. We both want rising standards of living.

I favor it too, because we have a tremendous job to do which is to watch, together with Britain and France, over Germany to see that the German nation does not rise to military power and, in particular, that the Germans cannot sell themselves to one of the rivals and thus evade the consequences of defeat. (*Applause.*)

It may be argued that the social system of the Russians predestines them to be our rivals. If this were inevitable—if the Russians one day should set out to rule the world—I should of course advocate resisting them by all available means, but nobody with reason can make the statement that this is what the Russians wish and intend, or what their social system commits them to. There would be nothing behind such a statement but bigotry and fear.

We must not build a foreign policy of such poor material. If it is argued that we cannot have a fruitful partnership with a nation that does not accord the same liberties to its citizens which we accord to ours, then the Good-Neighbor policy in Latin America

will have to go, too, for not a half dozen Latin American countries have really democratic governments.

Through all our history, we have enjoyed good and healthful relations with Czarist Russia; Soviet Russia should be far easier to deal with.

We may be told that Soviet Russia wants no partner, but there is much evidence that Soviet Russia wants a partner for peace as much as we do. What Soviet Russia does not have is a good experience with a partner for most of the last 25 years. We are the strongest nation on earth, we have the greatest concentration of productive capacity ever known. Do not let anyone try to fool you that the Soviet Union would not like a solid, fruitful, peacemaking, prosperity making partnership with us.

So it is for us to provide the Soviet Union the experience of mature, friendly, sound cooperation in the interests of peace, and to dedicate ourselves to anything less is to get less and deserve it. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Raymond Swing. Now, gentlemen, it ought to be safe for us to have a little give-and-take up here around the microphone before we go into the audience question period. Mr. Chamberlin, I believe you have a question at this point.

Mr. Chamberlin: Well, I think, Mr. Moley, you suggested that in Poland and the Baltic States and other neighboring countries, Rus-

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

NORMAN THOMAS — Best known of American Socialists, Norman Thomas was the candidate of his party for President in 1928, 1932, 1936, 1940, and 1944. Born in Ohio, he received an A.B. degree at Princeton and a B.D. at Union Theological Seminary. Following his ordination as a Presbyterian minister in 1911, he served in several New York City churches until 1931, when he demitted the ministry.

In 1918, Mr. Thomas founded the *World Tomorrow* which he edited for three years. His success with this publication led him in 1921 to become editor for one year of *The Nation*.

Mr. Thomas is chairman of the executive committee of the Post-War World Council. He is the author of many magazine articles and numerous books. Among his books are *The Conscientious Objector in America*, later reprinted under the title, *Is Conscience a Crime?*; *America's Way Out—A Program for Democracy*; *As I See It* (with Paul Blanchard); *War—No Profit, No Glory, No Need*; *Socialism on the Defensive* and *We Have a Future*.

RAYMOND SWING—Blue Network Commentator Raymond Swing, was born in Cortlandt, New York, in 1887. He attended Oberlin College and Conservatory of Music and has degrees from Oberlin, Olivet, Williams, Muhlenberg, Lafayette, and Harvard. Mr. Swing began a newspaper career in Cleveland and later worked on papers in Orrville, Ohio, Richmond, Indiana; Indianapolis, Indiana, and Cincinnati, Ohio. From 1913 to 1917, he was Berlin correspondent for the *Chicago Daily News*. In 1918, he became an examiner for the War Labor Board but returned to Germany in 1919 to become Berlin correspondent for the *New York Herald*. The foreign service of the *Wall Street Journal* engaged his time from 1922 to 1924. Then he became London correspondent for the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* and the *New York Evening Post*, a position he held until 1934.

From 1934 to 1936, Mr. Swing was a member of the board of editors of *The Nation*. Then he reversed his usual procedure and became New York correspondent for the *London News Chronicle*. In 1935 he became a news commentator on American affairs for the British Broadcasting System, and on foreign af-

fairs for the American School of the Air. For several years he was commentator on foreign affairs for the Mutual Broadcasting System and since 1942 has been with the Blue Network.

Mr. Swing is the author of *Forerunners of American Fascism*, *How War Came*, and *Preview of History*. He is also a contributor to both English and American magazines.

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN — For 18 years a correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor* in Russia, Japan, and France, Mr. Chamberlin has recently been a lecturer on Japan at the Harvard School for Overseas Administration. He was born in Brooklyn in 1897. After his graduation from Haverford College in 1917, he was assistant magazine editor of the *Philadelphia Press* for one year. From 1919 to 1922, he was assistant book editor of the *New York Tribune*. In 1922, he went to Moscow for the *Monitor*.

In addition to his newspaper and magazine writings, Mr. Chamberlin is the author of many books including *Soviet Russia* (1930); *The Soviet Planned Economic Order* (1931); *Russia's Iron Age* (1934); *The Russian Revolution, 1917-21* (1935); *Collectivism — A False Utopia* (1937); and *Japan Over Asia* (1937).

RAYMOND MOLEY — Author, journalist, professor, and former Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Moley was born in Berea, Ohio, in 1886. His degrees include Ph.B. from Baldwin-Wallace College (Berea); A.M. from Oberlin; Ph.D. from Columbia; and LL.D. from Baldwin-Wallace and Washington and Jefferson. Before becoming a professor of public law at Columbia University in 1928, Mr. Moley had been school superintendent in Olmsted Falls, Ohio; a teacher at West High School, Cleveland, Ohio; instructor and assistant professor of politics at Western Reserve University; director of the Cleveland Foundation; and associate professor of government at Columbia.

In 1933, Mr. Moley served as Assistant Secretary of State. He was editor of *Today* from 1933 to 1937, and since 1937 has been an associate editor and columnist for *Newsweek*. Mr. Moley is the author of many books dealing with crime, government, and politics.

sia wants only so-called friendly governments. I think we would all agree that friendship—real friendship—between Russia and

its neighbors would be a healthy, desirable development. But do you think wholesale arrests, executions, and deportations to forced labor

of the Polish and Baltic patriots are measures likely to produce friendship?

Mr. Moley: I would say that if any such thing as that has happened, I would like to hear the details about it. The calling of the 16 gentlemen who disappeared in Russia patriots, is very strange inasmuch as Secretary Stettinius said he didn't know anything about them.

Mr. Thomas: There are lots of things he may not know about. That wouldn't prove it, necessarily.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Chamberlin, do you want to get in there and be a little more specific about it?

Mr. Chamberlin: Well, I could give Mr. Moley some information. I think he could easily have gotten it from his own magazine—about these Polish patriots. The Vice Premier, Jan Jankowski, was one of these victims of Soviet treachery and terrorism. Another was the Socialist, Casimir Puzak, chairman of the Council of National Unity. Quite a number of others belong to the Peasant Party and the Socialist Party and, as I said in my speech, Foreign Secretary Eden said they were just the kind of men who should have been consulted about the formation of the new government. Their arrest, when they were under safe conduct, was a cynical slap in the face to America and England and a tearing up of the Yalta agreement by Stalin. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Swing, do you want in on this?

Mr. Swing: Well, yes, I'd like to get in on this. The arrest while they were under safe conduct is a partisan statement based upon a statement of the Polish government-in-exile which has been denied by the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*) We have no evidence before us tonight to justify a statement. I also would like to say that only three of the members arrested were on the list that might have been suggested for consultation, and it is true that neither the British Government, nor the United States Government has full information as to the identity or the nature of these men. They were the "shadow cabinet" of the London government-in-exile. The general who was arrested with them had been out behind the Russian lines. They were arrested because that general had been behind the lines and they were the political arm of that same policy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Thomas?

Mr. Thomas: It seems to me that Mr. Swing argues this way: What the Russian Government says is true, what anybody else says isn't true. And you don't have to argue it except on that basis. (*Applause.*) As a matter of fact, it isn't sixteen; it's literally millions of deportations, of course a great many of them undertaken when Stalin and Hitler were partners, and Stalin assured Hitler that our friendship was cemented in blood.

Mr. Swing also says that it is appeasement to try to save the lives of 15-year-old Russian boys,

of Americans, yes, and of Japanese, by finding out whether we haven't already won what is necessary for peace and whether making a vacuum of annihilation in Japan isn't the way forever to make us hate it and to turn everything over to Stalin and that will be our fault. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you.

Mr. Swing: I don't know that it's worth the—Mr. Thomas has put words into my mouth in order to answer. I said that we did not have evidence before this meeting tonight on which to pass judgment, and if I didn't say that the audience will contradict me.

Mr. Thomas: May I say this—of course, the reason is that the limitations of time make it impossible to produce evidence. I've got it in that envelope. I only wish to God I had three hours to give it to you. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Swing: Representatives of the United States Government do not have the evidence.

Mr. Thomas: They say it out loud but I doubt it. They don't think it.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Chamberlin.

Mr. Chamberlin: Might I ask Mr. Swing what he thinks of the lack of democratic quality of Henrich Ehrlich, and Victor Alter, the left-wing Polish Socialists who were members of the Polish Parliament and went on under the so-called reactionary feudal regime of prewar Poland, and when they fell in the hands of the Soviet terrorists they were held in prison and finally butchered with-

out any trial at all, and their fate is simply symbolic of what is happening to Democrats and Socialists all over eastern Europe—would he call Ehrlich and Alter Fascist agents? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Swing.

Mr. Swing: Well, I'm not familiar with the—all the aspects. I'm only familiar with the charges that have been made on this. I have never seen any convincing evidence about it.

Mr. Thomas: May I say that I was very well familiar with Ehrlich, who was one of the greatest anti-Nazis and the purest Democrats and Socialists, I know. That I know—positively. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Moley: Well, I want to get this back to the subject. (*Laughter and applause.*) Mr. Thomas or Mr. Chamberlin, do you favor American withdrawal from the world organization now being set up? Do you or do you not?

Mr. Thomas: I'd like to see the organization. I hope it will be at least good enough to permit my support, for I want to support it. But I'd like to ask you, Mr. Moley—do you think that a repetition, with some camouflage, of the ancient method of alliance is going to save peace which never was thus saved before? Do you think, Mr. Moley, that if only the United States and Russia will stick together, regardless of justice, all will be well? Isn't justice of the essence of the matter, and did you ever know an alliance of power seekers to stick together without regard to justice? I want a feder-

ation on another basis. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Moley: He qualified that idea about an alliance, but there was an alliance formed in 1815 that kept peace a hundred years. I would take that all over again. I'm for peace in this matter.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Moley's idea of peace from 1815 to 1915 is very, very singular. I hope for something better. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, gentlemen, but it's time to let the audience in on this discussion. So let's pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting, the

program that gives both sides of questions vitally important to you, sponsored by the most widely read of all magazines—*The Reader's Digest*. For a complete copy of this discussion, "Russia and America—Postwar Rivals or Allies?" including the question period immediately following, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin.

Write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Enclose ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Please remember it takes from ten to fifteen days to print and distribute these Bulletins, so don't expect a reply by return mail. Now, *The Reader's Digest* returns you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now we're ready for the question period. I'll take the question from the gentleman right here. Yes?

Man: This question is addressed to Mr. Thomas. Since you, like all of us, want to see a speedy end to the war with Japan, what better way can you suggest than to get Russia's immediate help? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Thomas: The immediate enunciation of terms by the American people in accordance with their own traditions, which terms would provide for disarmament and an end of empire but would guarantee to the people of Japan inclusion in all the benefits of organized cooperation. I want Americans to say that before Stalin, of necessity by geographic

position, coming in calls the tune and the terms. I want it said so that Manchuria is not handed over to Stalin afterwards. I don't want my son dying in order that Stalin, rather than the Japanese, will be the real controller in Port Arthur. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The lady over here.

Lady: Mr. Moley. Desirable allies or not, do you nevertheless sense an insidious anti-Russian public opinion spreading throughout the United States?

Mr. Moley: There are certain articulate anti-Russians, some of whom make their living by it. (*Applause and shouts.*) I would like to add that no poll of public opinion indicates that there is any preponderant anti-Russian feeling in this country. This country loves

that great country that spent twelve million lives to save three million American lives. (*Applause.*) One more thing: I have never in all my broadcasting or my writing had such a reaction from the public, from the middle-class Americans—not from the “Commies,” I’ve no use for them, let me say that—as I’ve had from a defense of Russia in the present petty bickering charges against Russia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Moley. Now, the gentleman here.

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Chamberlin. Mr. Chamberlin, in view of the fact that there has never been one commercial dispute with the Soviet Union since 1919, how do you account for the fact that any trouble that we’ve had with Russia, and the trouble that it seems to me that we’re getting into now, is only due to writers, only due to political people, who are always stirring something up. Why can’t political writers, why can’t our so-called politicians act the same as our business men do?

Mr. Denny: Yes, go ahead. That’s a \$95 question, Mr. Chamberlin.

Mr. Chamberlin: In the first place, the statement is untrue. There have been a great many business disputes between Russia and America since 1919, and, of course, all American property in Russia at the time of the Revolution was confiscated by the Soviet Government. It never paid any compensation and that confiscation was never formally recog-

nized. But I don’t think that trade is in any sense the basic issue and I also think the questioner perhaps belongs a little bit to the school of Dr. Coué in the sense that he blames people for commenting on acts of the Soviet Government. I’m sure it wasn’t political writers or commentators who killed Ehrlich and Alter and who took a great part of Eastern Europe. If Stalin had not done these things, these supposedly malignant writers would have had nothing to say, so I think he’s really in this case mistaking the barometer for the bad weather in American-Soviet relations. I think the difficulties are political rather than economic. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Chamberlin. The gentleman right here. Yes.

Man: Mr. Swing, don’t you believe that the United States and Russia in the postwar world will conflict in the scramble for world markets?

Mr. Swing: I should not think that there was any possibility of that for a good many years because the world markets are very much depleted. Russia’s own capacity is going to be devoted to raising the Russian standard of living, which is a twenty-year job, and they’ll need our help and our credits and our machine tools to do that. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the balcony there. Yes.

Man: Mr. Thomas, if Russia fails to join us in war against

Japan will that be due to astute policy or dumb stupidity?

Mr. Thomas: I think that Russia properly will make up her mind—I mean Stalin will make up Russia's mind properly—whether to come into the war with Japan and how far to come in and when in accordance with Russian interests, which he knows better than we. He can do what he did with Bulgaria—be at war four days—and by geographical position, he can practically determine the nature of the peace. To prevent that, I want us, on proper considerations based on lasting peace, to say what we want, not only in Japan, but in Asia.

May I say that I do not speak disrespectfully of Stalin's intelligence or his purpose and that I do not believe it impossible to cooperate. It's Mr. Moley who, I think, would find it hard to explain how Communists are no good but Stalin, the chief of them, is wonderful. It isn't I who hold that opinion. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Moley, do you want to fight? No, he says he is a peaceful man. All right. Go ahead. The lady in the back row, please.

Lady: Mr. Swing. Do you not think there is an increased individual distrust of Russia and fear of an eventual war? What would you suggest as the most effective method of combating this?

Mr. Swing: I think one of the most effective methods of combating it is to have discussion, intelligent writing, that we under-

stand what our national interests are, and that Americans who understand what our national interests are tell their Congressmen what they think about it. I have no question that the bulk of American people are not taking part in any insidious fear of the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. This gentleman right here.

Man: Mr. Moley, undiplomatically and commercially speaking, don't you think that America will be handicapped in foreign trade competition because Russia's foreign trade always has been and will be subsidized on a political and ideological basis, to the detriment of American wage earners?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Moley. That's what you lawyers call a leading question.

Mr. Moley: I have tried to keep out of this discussion the question of any material interest which we have in maintaining peace with Russia beyond maintaining the peace of the world between us. I expect that there will be a give-and-take in commercial transactions, that Russia will take business away from us, that we'll take business away from Russia. I would say this also about the competition between this country and Great Britain in the markets of the world. But because I believe that we have difficulty in trading with Britain because they are so smart, I certainly don't believe in a consistent and provoked deterioration of our relations with

regard to maintaining the peace of the world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Moley. This gentleman back here.

Man: This question is directed to Mr. Chamberlin. If Russia is a rival, how will our future peace organization work if we do not cooperate with her, since one vote on the Security Council can upset the table?

Mr. Chamberlin: Well, I think on the record to date, there is far more danger of Russia not cooperating with us than of our not cooperating with Russia. We kept every promise that we made in admitting the Ukrainian and White Russian Delegations, giving Russia three votes and it is not we, it is Stalin who has torn up the Yalta agreement, so that I think the actual working at any peace organization will have to depend upon just those conditions that I laid down for Soviet-American friendship, namely, good faith on both sides and abstention from aggressive techniques of infiltration, Fifth Column conquests of other countries, and full equality and reciprocity in relations between America and Russia and between all countries great and small in the organization. I fully agree with Winston Churchill when he said that the organization would not be worth much if it were merely to be a shield for the strong and a mockery for the weak. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady in the balcony, please.

Lady: My question is to Mr. Thomas. Why is the question of Russia's refusal to acknowledge a reactionary government - in - exile very different from the presenting of Argentina with the British Falkland Islands politically?

Mr. Denny: I knew we would have Argentina in here before the evening was over. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Thomas: I wish we had time to discuss the Argentine question. I'm not responsible for the State Department's policy and we have a right to criticize it. However, there is a considerable difference. Argentina is about as bad or as good as a good many other states at San Francisco and it was not the subject of a special agreement—I think a bad agreement—at Yalta. The question begs the question really by saying "the reactionary government" at London. That is a matter that requires analysis. I'd like it to be better. You'd be surprised how many governments I would like to improve—(*laughter*) even beginning in Washington. (*Applause and laughter.*) I think in view of the records of the men and parties that support the London government as against the records of other men and other parties that support the Lublin government, the adjective is not justified. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The man there.

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Swing. Iago said of Othello, "Though I do hate him as I do hell-pains yet, for necessity of present life, I must show

out a flag and sign of love." Is this your idea of a Russian-American partnership. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Swing: It certainly is not. It is not a partnership that is to be based on suppressed hate. The people of the Soviet Union and the people of the United States are very similar in very many ways and the more they get a chance to know each other, the more they are going to like each other. I'm sure of it. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you.

Mr. Thomas: How about having a Town Meeting in Russia? (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Say that again a little closer, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas: Well, a practical test is this. When Stalin will permit a Town Meeting in Russia to discuss this issue as we have discussed it here, then we are in a better state. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: We herewith invite Mr. Stalin to make use of Town Meeting. (*Laughter.*) We'd be delighted to have a two-way discussion. I hope that both Mr. Swing and Mr. Thomas will be on the program. (*Applause.*) We'll take the lady way over there.

Lady: My question is addressed to Mr. Thomas. I would like to ask where did Mr. Thomas get the pedigree of the 15 arrested Poles? Were there any Democrats in Poland before the war? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Thomas: That is another one of those questions that by the way it is asked assumes an answer. It says were there any Democrats

in Poland before the war? Yes, there were. Some of them were in jail. (*Laughter.*) Some of them at times were in office—Democrat being a relative word. The pedigree of three of those gentlemen has been given by Mr. Chamberlin. But the question is not whether or not these gentlemen were perfect, it is a question of the sanctity of a promise at Yalta. It is a question of whether or not an honest effort will be made to carry out what I thought was a bad agreement for constituting a government. No question of interpretation of words can change that basic issue. Instead of an effort to carry out Yalta, every effort was made to block it. That's the fact, and if the men were worse than they were, that fact would damn it. Let the Russians prove the villainy of these men, not just by assertion. When Stalin is discussed, apparently the old American doctrine that a man is supposed to be innocent until he is proved guilty goes by the board. Let him prove the guilt of the Russians and not put them incommunicado, in jail, or possibly to death. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. The gentleman here.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Moley. Before last summer, Russia was at peace with Bulgaria. After Bulgaria had virtually agreed to the surrender terms of Britain and the United States, the Russian Government declared war on Bulgaria, moved in, and made terms of its own. In the light

of this evidence how do you justify your stand on tonight's question? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Moley, how come?

Mr. Moley: Russia's peace with Bulgaria was a Pickwickian peace, up to those four days. Russia moved through Bulgaria in the process of making war on countries that were to the west of Bulgaria. We all seem to overlook the fact that Russia has been moving into countries who were the allies of Hitler. You will admit that Bulgaria was an ally of Hitler. Therefore, the action of Russia in protecting her own troupes in those countries is something different from the action of ourselves in France, Belgium; or Holland. I think that's one point that is frequently overlooked. As for Bulgaria, I certainly, considering the record of Bulgaria, would have imposed any kind of a peace that I could and put my own friends in power and watched those friends.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Moley. Mr. Thomas has a comment.

Mr. Thomas: It's important to understand this: The United States was at war with Bulgaria practically from December 7 on. It was our airmen who destroyed a large part of the capital city of Sofia. Russia was not at war with Bulgaria except for four days and only began after the Bulgarians had sued for peace. She now excludes all Americans, tells the Bulgarians we destroyed their

capital city and in the course of the purge has killed some of the most outstanding Democrats—and Mr. Moley says he's one—in Bulgaria. That what I don't like. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady here.

Lady: This question is either for Mr. Moley or Mr. Swing because one or the other of the gentlemen said that twelve million Russians had died in the cause of saving three million Americans. I would like to ask, whichever one of the gentlemen said that, why did Russia go to war? What was the immediate cause? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Moley: Russia went to war for the precise reason which has been given from one end of this country to the other as the reason why the United States went to war—because they were attacked. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right, thank you. Mr. Moley?

Mr. Moley: I'd like to say this because Mr. Thomas butted in on my Bulgarian question, (*laughter*) that these people like Mr. Thomas who are bleeding about Bulgaria, I'd like to have them describe to us the democracy of King Boris. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Thomas: King Boris is dead—long ago!

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Moley, and I wish there were time.

Now while these speakers prepare to summarize this evening's discussion, you're going to hear from Mr. Chamberlin and Mr.

Moley both in just a few minutes, America's Town Meeting and *The Digest* are honored to present a special guest. He's a young man who's devoted all of his great talent to the war effort. A cartoonist, a writer, he has created Terry and the Pirates since 1934. Since 1942 he's been doing a special strip — Male Call — for service papers, and he has given much of his time to entertaining fighting men in camps and hospitals throughout the country. Here he is—Milton Caniff. Mr. Caniff. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Caniff: Since Pearl Harbor, the comic strip characters have been in this war up to their necks. It's the same war that put a uniform on millions of men and women, sent home front Americans into war plants. It's the same war that's taken guys like me into hospitals and camps. The other day, six of us went down to Atlantic City to England General Hospital. In the auditorium, my colleagues and I put on a show. We drew characters from our respective strips. The audience was great, believe me—no matter what's happened to those boys, they haven't lost their sense of humor. We were doing our stuff when all of a sudden the lights went out and I said to a soldier on the front row—"Okay, we'll leave. You don't have to kick us out."

The soldier laughed and said, "Me kick you out? Small chance."

That boy had lost both of his legs, but he wasn't bitter. He was

a guy with courage—a good guy. And you know, lots of good guys have lost legs and arms. A lot of them have lost their lives to give you and me the chance to live in a peaceful world.

Well, there's a lot of war to fight still and the men who are fighting need our money to keep up the fight. Our money invested in War Bonds buys the weapons that are needed. Let's get it over with as quickly as possible. Dig down deep. Buy extra war bonds now—Mighty Seventh War Loan. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Caniff. It was an honor to have you with us. Now for summaries of tonight's discussion. Mr. Moley, will you give us the summary for your side, please?

Mr. Moley: This isn't a summary. We feel that we have summarized our position and I'm going to use this minute to finish the speech that your generous applause prevented me from finishing, and make one other point that's in the minds of everyone, and that is Browderism. That is alleged as the reason for breaking peaceful relations with Russia. The answer to that is that Browderism is partly a police and partly a political problem, but it is an American problem.

In any case, I don't enjoy the position of those who would ask Russia, please, to come over here and support our Communists. If they are subversive, put them in jail. I certainly would not put them on the federal payroll. But

if we deal with them drastically, I think Stalin would respect us the more. Russia would rather have American machine tools in Russian factories than Browder tools in the New York City Council.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Raymond Moley. Now Mr. Chamberlin will you give us a summary for your side, or do you choose to add to your speech?

Mr. Chamberlin: Norman Thomas has stressed the probable disastrous results for China and for our own Far Eastern policy of heedless prolongation of the war in that part of the world that will play into the hands of Stalin. I have emphasized what seemed to me the three essential conditions of American-Soviet understanding and Browderism wasn't one of them, as you may have noticed.

Mr. Thomas and I abhor the thought of Soviet-American wars—of any new war—but we don't believe that appeasement offers any guarantee against war. As American citizens who believe in freedom of speech and expression, we resent the attempt of Communists, fellow travelers, and misguided appeasers to limit that right of discussion in relation to Russia and we propose to continue to discuss Russian policy just as freely as we shall discuss American, British, French, or Chinese policies.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Chamberlin, Norman Thomas, Raymond Moley, and Raymond

Swing, and the members of this audience of 1,600 people here at Town Hall for an anniversary program of vital importance that will be long remembered.

You friends who are listening can do your part to help generate an honestly informed opinion in America by talking these programs over with your friends, or organizing informal Town Meeting discussion groups of your own. How about inviting a neighbor or two over next Thursday night to listen to the program with you? It's a topic you won't want to miss. It affects your pocketbook and the general economic condition of the country. How about it, Fred Cole?

Mr. Cole: Right, Mr. Denny, it certainly does. Next week your Town Meeting will discuss the question "Should the Lid Be Kept On Prices During Postwar Reconversion?" Leon Henderson, former director of the Office of Price Administration, chairman of the board of editors of the Research Institute of America, and Murray D. Lincoln, executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, think we should. Congressman A. L. Miller, Republican of Nebraska, and Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican of Ohio, think we should not. What is your opinion?

That program will originate in the Hartman Theater, Columbus, Ohio, and our host next week will be Station WCOL and the Columbus Town Meeting. So listen next Thursday and every Thursday for the sound of the crier's bell.

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW

Should the German People Be Held Responsible for the Crimes of Their Nazi Leaders?

By CHARLES E. MARTZ

The subject outlined in this preview is to our best knowledge the one which will be used on Town Meeting of the Air Thursday evening, June 14, 1945. However, in view of the rapidity of wartime developments there is always a possibility that another topic which seems more urgent may be substituted.

In dealing with Germany and its people, there are two matters upon which there probably will be little disagreement:

1. *Germans who are convicted—after orderly trials—of direct responsibility for war crimes must be punished in a way that will impress the whole world.*

2. *The treatment of other Germans—those who cannot be directly connected with war crimes—must be pointed toward the future peace of Europe and not toward revenge.*

The Town Meeting discussion will be concerned with this second aspect of the question. How can we bring about a situation in Germany which will make for peace rather than for tension in the world?

On one side, it is not too difficult to bring a serious indictment against the German people. Three times within less than a century, the German Reich has plunged Europe into war. In 1870 came the last of the three wars precipitated by Bismarck. This war of 1870 against France resulted in the unification of the German states into the German Empire. With the two wars in this generation we are all

too familiar. Three times, Germany has taken the initiative in bringing war.

Disagreements appear when we try to explain this seeming national delight in war. Most of the German individuals that we know intimately seem to be serene and peaceful persons. Yet, united in a modern nation, that nation has become a threat to the peace of the world. Why is this true?

The simplest explanation may possibly be found in a recent dispatch of AP's Kenneth Dixon. "The tractability of German citizens, born out of a generation of being told what to do, has become simultaneously a godsend and a headache to American troops. . . . They won't walk out of their houses without asking questions"—as to what to do and how to behave.

Perhaps the word "generation" in this sentence does not tell the whole story. The malady may be deep. Morley Cassidy, writing for the North American Newspaper Alliance, says, quoting an Army officer, "The plain fact is that, despite individual intelligence, Germans as a whole are politically immature. They have consistently

been a century behind the rest of the civilized world in political development, hamstrung by age-old traditions of subservience to leadership, good or bad."

This diagnosis is worth study. It may be true that the average German has had nothing to do with bringing war. The average German soldier may have had little or nothing to do with atrocities. The fact remains that some conditions existed, and perhaps still exist, which cause most Germans to follow constituted leadership, without regard to the character of that leadership.

When we discuss the "punishment" of the German people, then, we will have to come to some conclusion about the reasons for their being the warmongers among the nations of Europe. Are the Germans naturally warlike? Or are they politically so backward that they have docilely followed bad leadership? Their treatment for the future will depend pretty much upon the answer at which we arrive.

The Present German Picture—

In debating future punishment, it might be relevant to take an inventory of the present situation in which the German people find themselves. No matter what policies we adopt, will the German people suffer punishment?

It is surely true that conditions now are very different from those of 1918. There are few German cities now that are not marked with miles of rubble. The Germans will not soon forget this

war. For generations they will be struggling from beneath the load which it has heaped upon them. The German standard of living will sink. In the current year, there will be many hungry Germans. Most Germans will suffer as a result of the war.

Whether they learn from their plight that war does not pay, or whether, as in 1918, they merely find out once more that losing a war does not pay, is material for our present discussion.

The chances are that very few Americans will argue against a "stern peace" for Germany. Our present question, however, has a flavor that is a little different. We are asking about "punishment" for all Germans. We cannot go back to the penal concepts of past centuries and adopt "social surgery" as our method. We cannot eliminate the German people from our world body. We must find the kind of penal procedure which has the best chance of reducing the probability of a recurrence of the crime.

The modern penologist insists that we first ask the reason for the criminal actions. There is a tendency toward the indeterminate sentence. Where there is promise of reform, institutions for that purpose are indicated rather than those whose function is purely for punishment. Our eyes are on the future. Any plan for the treatment of the German people must have the same outlook if it is to be effective.